

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above Claims. Claims 1-3 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-3 are amended herein. Claims 4-8 have been cancelled herein. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have cancelled Claims 4 and 8 and respectfully submit the rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koshikawa (JP 03095717 A), in view of United States Patent Number 6,396,667 B1 to Zhang. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3 are patentable over Koshikawa in view of Zhang for the following rational.

Applicants respectfully note that “[a] prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(VI); *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984)). Moreover, Applicants note that “[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious” (emphasis added) (MPEP 2143.01; *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)). Moreover, “[i]f the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed amendment” (emphasis added) (MPEP 2143.01; *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

Applicants would like to point out that neither Koshikawa nor Zhang teach or suggest an airflow shroud, as claimed. In particular, Koshikawa teaches a “magnetic

head” with a “shield block” for reducing magnetic interference. The principal teaching of Koshikawa is magnetic shielding. Applicants do not understand how the Examiner has extended the magnetic shielding characteristics of Koshikawa to teaching airflow control. Koshikawa fails to teach or suggest airflow control and is specifically concerned with magnetic shielding.

Additionally, Koshikawa fails to teach or suggest a moving-type microactuator, as claimed. Applicants do not understand how the magnetic shielding on a non-microactuator drive can be assumed to provide airflow control in a microactuator drive, as claimed.

Furthermore, the Examiner has relied on Zhang as teaching a microactuator. While Applicants agree that Zhang teaches the use of a microactuator, Applicants strongly submit that Zhang, as with Koshikawa, fails to teach or suggest airflow control, and particularly, Zhang fails to teach or suggest an airflow shroud, as claimed. Applicants submit the principal teaching of Zhang to be suspension characteristics to control “stiffness.”

Zhang goes into detail on how stiffness characteristics are important for a high resolution drive. In particular, Zhang teaches the use of “deflection limiters,” “cooling fins” and “pre-load” to “provide desirable stiffness characteristics to interface a microactuator with other disk drive components.” However, Zhang fails to teach or suggest controlling airflow to improve drive performance.

Applicants submit that the principal teachings of both Zhang and Koshikawa fail to include an airflow shroud, as claimed. Furthermore, Applicants assert that the proposed modification of Koshikawa with the microactuator of Zhang would result unsatisfactory for its intended purpose because neither Zhang nor Koshikawa teach or suggest airflow control with a shroud, as claimed.

For this rational, Applicants submit that Claims 1-3 are patentable over Koshikawa in view of Zhang and respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koshikawa in view of Mei (6,611,399). Applicants have cancelled Claims 4 and 8 herein and believe the rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-3 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: June 30, 2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Dr.
Watsonville, CA 95076